Calendar No. 956

100TH CONGRESS
2d Session

SENATE

REPORT
100-521

FEDERAL COURTS STUDY ACT

SEPTEMBER 22 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 7), 1988.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. BIDEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 951]

The Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 951) to establish a Federal Courts Study Commission, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments and recommends that the bill, as amended, do pass.

CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Purpose	1
II.	Legislative history	1
III.	Discussion	3
IV.	Vote of the committee	6
V.	Text of S. 951, as reported	6
VI.	Section-by-section analysis	10
VII.	Cost estimate	11
VIII.	Regulatory impact statement	13
IX.	Changes in existing law	13

I. PURPOSE

To establish a Federal Courts Study Commission for aiding Congress in its constitutional mandate to establish and provide for the federal judiciary. The Commission will collect and review information regarding the workings of the federal courts, and provide proposals to enhance the judiciary's ability to meet present and future needs.

II. LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

When the federal judiciary was little more than a year old, members of the first Congress of the United States felt it desirable to call on outside assistance to examine the

S523-22

> functioning of the federal courts and to recommend to Congress measures for their improvements. Thus, Attorney General Edmund Randolph was requested to prepare a report on the operations of the federal courts and to recommend such legislation as he thought desirable to cure defects in the system * * * Thus the precedent was set early for the use by Congress of special outside assistance in discharging its reponsibilities for keeping the judiciary in position to administer justice under law.[1]

Since that time, there have been numerous studies prepared on the functioning, personnel and needs of the federal courts, particularly within the past 20 years. Some of the studies include:

(1) American Bar Foundation work on the courts of appeals;

(2) the Freund Committee under the direction of the Federal Judicial Center;

(3) the Advisory Committee on Appellate Justice;

(4) the Hruska Commission established by Attorney General Edward Levi in 1976, and

(5) proposals submitted by the Office of Improvements for the Administration of Justice.[2]

While each study has contributed to our knowledge concerning our court system, the limited scope of the studies unduly restricted their ability to deal with fundamental problems of the federal judicial system.

Congress, within the past two decades, has expanded the jurisdiction of the federal courts. This has promoted legislators and judicial officers to voice concern over the increased caseload confronting the federal system and the possibility of an erosion of our federalist principles.

In response to the increased responsibility placed upon the federal system and in an attempt to maintain a balance between federal and state court jurisdictions, Senator Strom Thurmond introduced for himself and Senator Howell Heflin S. 3123 on September 17, 1980. The bill proposed a 16-member commission for a 2-year period to study the jurisdictional basis of both state and federal courts and the workload facing the courts. This bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and subsequently referred to the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery. There was no further action taken on the bill.

In the 97th Congress, both Senator Thurmond and Senator Heflin introduced separate legislation to establish a commission to study the future of the judiciary. Senator Thurmond introduced S. 675 on March 10, 1981, which was identical to S. 3123 introduced in the 96th Congress. Senator Heflin introduced S. 1530 on July 29, 1981, to establish a permanent Federal Courts Study Council, and a temporary commission to study and make recommendations to the council. This bill was referred to the Subcommittee on Separation of Powers.

---

[1] "To Establish a Commission to Study the Federal Courts: Hearings on S. 675 and S. 1530" before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 97th Cong., 2d Sess. (1982); (statement of Daniel J. Meador, James Monroe Professor of Law, University of Virginia) [hereinafter referred to as Senate Hearings (1982)].

[2] Id. at 23.

Senator Heflin chaired hearings held by the Committee on the Judiciary to consider S. 675 and S. 1530.[3] The hearings were held on May 12, 1982. The witnesses included legal scholars, judicial officers from the federal courts of appeals and executive officers of judicial administrative organization.

After reviewing the testimony of the witnesses, Senator Thurmond and Senator Heflin agreed to combine the two bills into a single measure and S. 675 was reported to the Senate from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in the nature of a substitute on September 15, 1982. S. 675 passed the Senate on October 1, 1982, by voice vote, and was subsequently sent to the House and referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary.

On February 2, 1983, Senator Heflin introduced S. 381, the Federal Courts Study Act. The bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and subsequently referred to the Subcommittee on Courts. As part of an extensive hearing on the problems facing our federal judiciary, testimony was received supporting the Federal Courts Study Act.[4]

On June 29, 1983, the Subcommittee on Courts approved S. 381 with amendments, for consideration by the full committee. On that same date, the subcommittee also approved for the full committee's consideration S. 645, the Court Improvements Act of 1983. The subcommittee incorporated provisions of S. 381 into S. 645, as Title V. There was no further action on S. 645. On June 14, 1984, the Committee on the Judiciary ordered S. 381 to be reported favorably with amendments. The Senate did not consider the legislation.

Senator Heflin again introduced similar legislation in the 99th Congress.

On April 8, 1987, Senator Heflin introduced S. 951. The bill was sent to the Senate Judiciary Committee and subsequently referred to the Subcommittee on Courts and Administrative Practice. The subcommittee held a hearing on June 15, 1987, chaired by Senator Howell Heflin. The Honorable J. Clifford Wallace, of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, and Leo Levin testified at the hearing in support of the legislation.

The subcommittee considered S. 951 on February 16, 1988, and reported the bill, with an amendment, to the full Judiciary Committee. The amendment adopted in subcommittee reflected suggestions by the Judicial Conference and related to the purposes of the Commission and the reporting requirements. On March 24, 1988, S. 951 was discussed by the full committee and at the suggestion of Senator Metzenbaum, Senator Heflin offered an amendment to reduce the time of the Commission from 10 years to 5 years and the authorization for funding from $8 million to $4 million. As amended, the bill was ordered to be reported favorably to the Senate.

III. DISCUSSION

There is no doubt that the orderly and effective administration of justice is the key to ensuring the life, liberty and happiness of

---

[3] Id.

[4] "Court Improvements Act of 1983: Hearings on S. 645" before the Subcommittee on Courts of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 98th Cong., 1st Sess. (1983).

all Americans. Our constitutional freedom is premised on certain assumptions; one is the belief that our judicial system will serve the needs of every individual.[5]

We cannot be a completely free society if our courts are not equipped to render justice equally and swiftly. We cannot be free when intercircuit conflicts and backlogs of cases prevent the orderly enforcement of our most cherished constitutional rights.[6] We cannot be free if we continue to ignore the mounting pressures being exerted on our court system.

Congress has a constitutional mandate to provide for the judiciary and govern its structure and jurisdiction.[7] As part of that mandate, it is the responsibility of Congress to look ahead: to learn from the past, to analyze the present and to prepare for the future.

The federal courts have undergone substantial changes over the last two decades in their size, the nature of their business, their personnel and their processes. These changes are the result of a near explosive growth in the volume of litigation and in the nature of claims being presented to the courts.[8]

In 1987, there were 37,000 cases filed in the federal courts of appeals. That same year, there were 851,402 cases filed in the federal district courts, including bankruptcy courts. There is disagreement as to whether the increase in filings is merely a reflection of the increase in population, but testimony received before the Subcommittee on Courts and Administrative Practice in June of 1987 indicates that population growth is not the sole answer. From 1975 to 1984, filings in the district court increased by 70.7 percent, and in the U.S. Courts of Appeal by 89 percent. This trend is also reflected by the increase of appeals in the state courts, where the number of appeals doubled in the 10-year period from 1973 to 1983, growing at a rate of 10 times faster than the population.[9]

Our courts are changing, and the ability of our courts to respond to these changes, now and in the future, is the reason this legislation is vital.

In July of 1980, former Chief Justice Warren Burger requested Judge Clifford Wallace of the U.S. Court of Appeals of the Ninth Circuit to take a comprehensive look at the judiciary and to consider problems the judiciary may encounter by the year 2000.[10]

Judge Wallace, after spending a great deal of time interviewing lawyers, judges and other individuals in the judicial field, prepared a working paper. The paper was presented to the Brookings Institute Conference at Williamsburg, which is an annual conference involving the three branches of government.

Judge Wallace concluded that the functioning of our present system will be inadequate by the year 2000. In reaching this conclusion, Judge Wallace analyzed both the input and output aspects of the courts' functions. The input analysis focused upon the types

---

[5] Senate Hearings (1982) (statement of Senator Howell Heflin).
[6] Id. at 1.
[7] Senate Hearings (1982), supra note 1, at 26 (statement of Daniel J. Meador).
[8] Id. at 25.
[9] *"Federal Courts Study Act: Hearings on S. 951"* before the Sucommittee on Courts and Administrative Practice of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 100th Cong. 1st. Sess. (1987), (statement of J. Clifford Wallace).
[10] *See* Wallace, Working Paper on the Future of the Judiciary, 94 F.R.D. 225 (1982).

of controversies that are injected into the court system. The output analysis was concerned with how to handle these controversies. As part of the input analysis, Judge Wallace focused on the role of the legislature in controlling the volume of litigation. While acknowledging that such control creates practical problems, Judge Wallace's working paper suggested that the legislature should be sensitive to the burdens being made on the courts and the impact that potential legislation may have on the court system.

In his recommendation for an indepth study of the problems and long-range goals of the judicial system, Judge Wallace suggested the study group should consist of not only legal scholars, but also practitioners of social science, economics and other disciplines.

In recent years, many ideas have been advanced for improving the federal judiciary and widespread data has been gathered. There has been some discussion as to why a Commission is needed and why a presently existing body cannot perform these duties.

Judge Wallace, in testimony before the subcommittee, made the following statement:

> A commission could bring together all the studies and, shedding preconceptions, make objective recommendations. Academic efforts generally are isolated. Broader-based efforts, such as the Civil Litigation Research Project or the ongoing work of the Rand Institute for Civil Justice, still do not aim toward a plan for future needs. The Federal Judicial Center and the Administrative Office of the United States Courts do not have a mandate for such comprehensive planning and, particularly with the Administrative Office, must allocate most efforts to servicing the courts.[11]

A commission composed of all three branches of government will be able not only to gather data and formulate possible solutions, but also suggest realistic ways to implement those changes. Final authority, of course, would lie with Congress to consider and enact the developed proposals.

The Federal Courts Study Commission, authorized by S. 951, will be responsible for making a complete study of the jurisdiction of the federal and state courts and reporting its findings to the three branches of government and various organizations. The Commission is also charged with the responsibility of evaluating public and private studies concerning the jurisdiction of the courts, and developing a long-range plan for how the judiciary will meet future demands.

The Commission is authorized to hold hearings, administer oaths and request the attendance of witnesses and the production of information. The chairman will appoint and set the compensation of an executive director and appoint other additional support personnel. The Commission is responsible for submitting an annual report to Congress and is authorized for 5 years.

It is no secret to the Judiciary Committee, to Congress and to the public that our present allocation of judicial resources needs some reworking. Some, in desperation, may voice the view that we should haphazardly attack the symptoms of judicial disorder to

---

[11] Id. at 5.

achieve some immediate, yet fleeting solutions. Others encourage a more cautious, thorough and lasting approach—an approach which will carry us through the turn of the century and beyond.

The Commission represents such an approach; it has the support of legislators, judges and legal scholars. The Commission is an investment in our future and it represents a commitment to a strong and lasting judicial system. This Commission will be given a different mandate than past Commissions. The purpose is not simply to study the problems facing the courts, but also to make recommendations to address those problems and, if those recommendations are implemented, to monitor their progress. The great Chief Justice John Marshall once wrote that our Constitution is "intended to endure for ages to come, and consequently to be adapted to the various crises of human affairs." [12]

The greatness of our Nation's judiciary will depend on our ability to determine our future needs and update our judicial system in line with our constitutional principles.[13] This legislation will help create a blueprint for the future by relying on a critical analysis of our past.

IV. VOTE OF THE COMMITTEE

On March 24, 1988, with a quorum present, by voice vote, the Committee on the Judiciary unanimously ordered the bill, S. 951, as amended, favorably reported.

V. TEST OF S. 951, AS REPORTED

[100th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL Entitled the "Federal Courts Study Act"

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Courts Study Act".

ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a Federal Courts Study Commission on the future of the Federal Judiciary (hereafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The purposes of the Commission are to—

(1) study the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States;

(2) examine problems currently facing the courts;

(3) order, receive, review, and evaluate reports from all dispute resolving bodies, including courts, administrative agencies, and alternative dispute resolution entities; and further, collect, review and evaluate all private and public studies concerning the jurisdiction and effectiveness of courts of the United States;

(4) report to the President, the Chief Justice of the United States, the Congress, the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Conference of Chief Justices, and the State Justice Institute, on the revisions, if any, in the Constitution and laws

---

[12] Senate Hearings (1982), supra note 1, at 2 (statement of Senator Howell Heflin).
[13] Id.

of the United States where the Commission, based on its study and evaluation, deems advisable; and

(5) develop a long-range plan for the future of the Federal Judiciary, including assessments involving—

(A) alternative methods of dispute resolution;

(B) the actual structure and administration of the Federal court system;

(C) methods of resolving intracircuit and intercircuit conflicts in the court of appeals; and

(D) the types of disputes resolved by the Federal courts and Federal agencies.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall be composed of fourteen members appointed, within ninety days after the effective date of this Act, as follows:

(1) four members appointed by the President of the United States with not more than two members from any major political party;

(2) two members of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, one of whom shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the majority leader and one of whom shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the minority leader;

(3) two members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, one of whom shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the majority leader and one of whom shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the minority leader;

(4) four members appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States with no more than two of such members from any major political party; and

(5) two members appointed by the Conference of Chief Justices, with no more than one such member being from any major political party.

(b) The membership of the Commission shall be selected in such a manner as to be broadly representative of the various interests, needs, and concerns which may be affected by the jurisdiction of the Federal courts.

(c) The term of office of each Commission member shall be five years. Any member who was appointed pursuant to paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a) who vacates such office during his term of office with the Commission shall vacate his position on the Commission also. A member appointed to fill any such vacancy shall be appointed only for the remainder of his predecessor's term. Vacancies in the Commission shall not affect its powers and shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) The Commission shall select a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(e) Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee thereof may, for the purpose of carrying out its functions and duties, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and request the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission, or any such subcommittee may deem advisable.

(b) The Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and the Federal Judicial Center, and each department, agency and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including the National Institute of Justice and independent agencies, shall furnish to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, such information and assistance as the Commission may reasonably deem necessary to carry out its functions under this Act, consistent with other applicable provisions of law governing the release of such information.

(c) Subject to such rules and regulations as may be adopted by the Commission, the Chairman shall have the power to—

(1) appoint and fix the compensation of an Executive Director, and such additional staff personnel as he deems necessary, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such Act relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, but at rates not in excess of the maximum rate for GS–18 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of such Act, and

(2) procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed $200 a day for individuals.

(d) To the extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts, the Commission is authorized to enter into interagency agreements or contracts with the Federal Judicial Center, the National Center for State Courts, Federal or State agencies, private firms, institutions, and individuals for the conduct of research or surveys, the preparation of reports, and other activities necessary to the discharge of its duties.

(e) The Commission is authorized to receive financial assistance from sources other than the Federal Government, including assistance from private foundations.

(f) The Commission is authorized, for the purpose of carrying out its functions and duties pursuant to this Act, to establish advisory panels consisting of members either of the Commission or of the public. Such panels shall be established to provide expertise and assistance in specific areas, as the Commission deems necessary.

FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission shall—

(1) make a complete study of the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States and the several States and report to the President, the Chief Justice of the United States, the Congress,

the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Conference of Chief Justices, and the State Justice Institute on such study within two years after the effective date of this Act;

(2) recommend revisions to be made to the Constitution and laws of the United States as the Commission, on the basis of such study, deems advisable;

(3) collect and review studies on the effectiveness of the courts;

(4) develop a long-range plan for the judicial system;

(5) submit annual written reports to the President, the Chief Justice of the United States, the Congress, the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Conference of Chief Justices, and the State Justice Institute on the condition of the judiciary, which shall contain a summary of their findings, recommendations, and conclusions, submitting the first such report within one year after the study concluded pursuant to paragraph (1);

(6) make any recommendations and conclusions it deems advisable every year thereafter.

(b) The study of the jurisdiction of the courts conducted by the Commission pursuant to paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall be completed within two years after the effective date of this Act and shall be given priority over the other functions and duties being carried out by the Commission during such time.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 6. (a) A member of the Commission who is an officer or full-time employee of the United States shall receive no additional compensation for his or her services, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, but such amount shall not exceed the maximum amounts authorized under section 456 of title 28, United States Code.

(b) A member of the Commission who is from the private sector shall receive $200 per diem for each day (including traveltime) during which he or she is engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of such duties, but such amounts shall not be in excess of the maximum amounts authorized under section 456 of title 28, United States Code.

REPORTS

SEC. 7. (a)(1) The Commission shall transmit to the President, the Chief Justice of the United States, the Congress, the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Conference of Chief Justices, and the State Justice Institute, not later than two years after the effective date of this Act, a study of the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States and of the several States pursuant to section 5(a)(1) of this Act. The Commission shall thereafter, in keeping with its functions, annually transmit to the President, the Chief Justice of the United States, the Congress, the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Conference of Chief Justices, and the State Jus-

tice Institute a report on the condition of the judiciary and summarize any findings, and make any recommendations and conclusions it deems advisable on the basis of its previous activities.

(2) Not later than five years after the effective date of this Act the Commission shall submit a final report containing a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the study conducted pursuant to this Act, together with any recommendations it deems advisable.

EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. The Commission shall cease to exist on the date ninety days after it transmits the final report pursuant to section 7 of this Act.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 9. To carry out the purposes of this Act there are authorized to be appropriated $800,000 for each of the fiscal years 1988 through 1992.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 10. This Act shall become effective upon the date of enactment.

VI. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1—Short Title

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Courts Study Act".

Section 2—Establishment and purposes of the Commission

This section establishes a Federal Courts Study Commission to study the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, examine problems currently facing the courts, evaluate existing studies concerning the effectiveness and jurisdiction of the courts, report to the three branches of government any changes in the laws, and develop a long-range plan for the future of the judiciary.

Section 3—Membership of the Commission

The Commission shall be composed of 14 members appointed as follows: four members appointed by the President, two members of the Senate appointed by the President Pro Tempore, two members of the House appointed by the Speaker, four members appointed by the Chief Justice, two members appointed by the Conference of Chief Justices. Members of the Commission are to serve 5-year terms.

Section 4—Powers of the Commission

This section provides the Commission with the power to hold hearings, to administer oaths, to request production of information, to appoint and fix the compensation of staff, to procure temporary and intermittent services, to enter into interagency agreements or contracts, to receive financial assistance from sources other than the federal government, including private foundations, and the power to establish advisory panels.

Section 5—Functions and Duties

The Commission shall make a complete study of the jurisdiction of the federal and state courts and report to the President, the Chief Justice of the United States, the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Conference of Chief Justices, and the State Justice Institute within 2 years after the effective date of the Act. Based on this study, the Commission shall recommend revisions to the Constitution and laws of the United States. The Commission's other duties include:

Collecting and reviewing studies on the effectiveness of the courts;

Developing a long-range plan for the judicial system;

Submitting annual written reports to the President, the Chief Justice, Congress, the Judicial Conference, the Conference of Chief Justices and the State Justice Institute on the condition of the judiciary beginning within 1 year after the study of jurisdiction; and

Making recommendations and conclusions.

Section 6—Compensation of Members

A member who is an officer or full-time employee of the United States will receive no additional compensation, but will be reimbursed for expenses. A member not employed by the government will receive $200 per diem plus reimbursement for expenses.

Section 7—Reports

The Commission shall within 2 years submit to the President, the Chief Justice, the Congress, the Judicial Conference, the Conference of Chief Justices, and the State Justice Institute, a study of the federal and state courts, and make an annual report thereafter on the condition of the judiciary. A final report containing the findings and conclusions of the study and any recommendations shall be made within 5 years.

Section 8—Expiration of the Commission

The Commission shall cease to exist 90 days after it submits its final report.

Section 9—Authorization of Appropriations

There shall be authorized to be appropriated $800,000 for each of the fiscal years 1988 through 1992.

Section 10—Effective Date

The provisions of this Act shall take effect upon the date of enactment.

VII. COST ESTIMATE

In accordance with paragraph 11(a), rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the committee offers the Report of the Congressional Budget Office:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, March 29, 1988.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the attached cost estimate for S. 951, the Federal Courts Study Act.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. BLUM,
Acting Director.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

MARCH 29, 1988.

1. Bill number: S. 951.
2. Bill title: Federal Courts Study Act.
3. Bill status: As ordered reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, March 24, 1988.
4. Bill purpose: S. 951 would establish a Federal Courts Study Commission to study a number of issues relating to the federal judiciary, including the jurisdiction of the courts. The commission would be responsible for developing a long-range plan for the judicial system, and would prepare annual reports on the condition of the judiciary.
5. Estimated cost to the federal government:

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993
Authorization level	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	.....
Estimated outlays	.....	.7	.8	.8	.8	00.1

The costs of this bill fall within budget function 750.

Basis of estimate: It is assumed that the full amounts authorized for each fiscal year will be appropriated. Because this estimate assumes enactment late in fiscal year 1988, any appropriation would occur sufficiently late in the year so that no significant outlays would occur in fiscal year 1988. For the other years, the outlay estimate is based on the historical spending rate for this type of activity.

6. Estimated cost to state and local governments: None.
7. Estimate comparison: None.
8. Previous CBO estimate: None.
9. Estimate prepared by: Mitchell Rosenfeld (226–2860).
10. Estimate approved by: James L. Blum, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

VIII. REGULATORY IMPACT STATEMENT

In compliance with paragraph 11(b), rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is hereby stated that the committee has concluded that the bill will have no direct regulatory impact.

IX. CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 12, rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, S. 951, as reported, makes no change in existing law.

○